

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Lee et al. (US 2002/0028626) for the same reasons as set forth in paragraph 2 of the first office action filed 5/24/05.

There are three independent claims in this case, 1, 2 and 4. These claims have been amended to clearly specify that the donor is in a non-contact relationship with the laterally spaced electrodes. This spacing is specified as being less than 10 microns in claim 4. But since there is a non-contact relationship the donor sheet can not be in direct contact with the laterally spaced electrodes. Contact transfers can be difficult due to heat loss to the receiving element which can prevent transfer of the material from the donor to the receiving element. Another problem is that of the donor sticking to the receiving element.

Lee in Fig. 13, depicts a schematic relationship where the donor sheet appears to be in contact with the substrate. There is no discussion of the problem solved by the present invention when there is a non-contact relationship as required by the claims.

The amended claims specify a non-contact relationship and require a gap of a controlled separation of the donor from the electrodes. As also discussed on page 24 lines 26-page 25 line 2, the material transferred from the donor is in an all or nothing situation. Clearly to have the transferred organic layer provided with a flat surface, all of the material must be transferred. Lee et al discuss laser beam power profiles. Assuming for the sake of argument, that it is desirable to have a flattened beam profile, there still will be taper edge regions due to material spreading during transfer from the donor to the receiver when there is a non-contact relationship between the donor and substrate. Lee et al have no discussion on how to minimize these tapered regions caused by material spreading in the non-contact situation. There is no discussion in Lee et al of the dimensions of their tapered regions nor of the separation between their donor and the electrodes. Clearly, Lee et al did not recognize an effective way to reduce these taper regions. It would not have been obvious to use the spaced relationship of the present invention as noted above.

It is believed that all of the independent claims in this case define unobvious subject matter and the entry of this amendment is respectfully

requested. The remaining claims depend upon the independent claims and should also be allowed.

The Examiner is treating the election of species as being without traverse. Applicants hereby accept the Examiner's position on election of species.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. L. Owens', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.